

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/073,226

Applicant(s)

YAMATO ET AL.

Examiner

Vickie Kim

Art Unit

1614

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Vickie Kim.

(3) _____

(2) Vicent Shier(Applicant's Rep.).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 21 October 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hofrichter et al(US 5591424).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner confirmed the unpatentability of the elected invention, claims 1-4, due to the reasons set forth in the previous office action(see paper no. 8). For example, Hofrichter9US'424)'s generic formula embraces the claimed compounds(e.g.glutamic acid amide derivatives). However, both parties agreed on two things where filing divisional applications with the emphasis on other inventions such as a composition or a method claim would be considered favorably or prosecuting the instant application with a narrower scope of the subject matter such as a compound containing aspartic acid residue rather than glutamic acid residues would also be favourably considered which requires new search .